

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/551,883	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PUSCHL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Celia Chang	<b>Art Unit</b> 1625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Celia Chang. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Margaret M. Buck. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 03 December 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: structure of CA138:304306 and CA141:332062.

Claim(s) discussed: 39,40 and 43.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner explained the issue with both R5 and R9 being halogen lacks explicit antecedent basis. Applicants will provide structural clarification of the instantly disclosed compounds and prior art compounds to show clear demarcation from the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Celia Chang/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625
--